



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,731	09/30/2004	Ricky Gene Braddy	2006579-0254	5730
69665 7590 06/17/2008 CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC. TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110			EXAMINER LANIER, BENJAMIN E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/711,731	BRADDY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin E. Lanier	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13,18-33,35-39 and 41-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13,18-33,35-39 and 41-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/9/2004;4/13/2006;5/1/2006;1/31/2008</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 11, 13, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Claim 11 recites the limitation "the first application session" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

4. Claim 11 recites the limitation "the second application session" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

5. Claim 13 requires continued execution of a disconnected session, which renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear what is being executed when no session connection exists.

6. Claim 23 recites the limitation "the transmitted information" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39, 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Underwood, U.S. Patent No. 7,100,195. Referring to claims 1-4, 18, 21, 30, 36, 42, 45, Underwood discloses an e-commerce system wherein network users request access to web resources within web sessions (Col. 57, lines 59-64 & Col. 58, lines 19-22), which meets the limitation of requesting, by a client node, access to a resource, requesting the resource over a network connection, at least one application session is active. Information regarding the user and the session is gathered using various scripts (Col. 58, lines 11-25, 45-60 & Col. 59, lines 35-45 & Col. 60, lines 10-67), which meets the limitation of gathering, by a collection agent, information about the client node, gathering the information over a network connection, gathering information by executing at least one script on the client node, receiving the gathered information. A determination is made based on the gathered information as whether the user is permitted access to the requested content (Col. 57, lines 64-67 & Col. 58, lines 39-43), which meets the limitation of making, by a policy engine, an access control decision based on the received information. The information gathered includes user and session information (Col. 58, lines 45-60), which meets the limitation of identifying one or more application sessions already associated with the user in response to the received information. If permitted, the user is granted access to the requested resource (Col. 57, lines 62-64), which meets the limitation of establishing, by a session server, a connection between a client computer operated by the user and the one or more application sessions identified in response to the received information, the one or more application sessions was connected to a first client computer prior to connection and, after connection, the one or more application sessions is reconnected to the first client computer.

Referring to claims 5, 6, Underwood discloses that a determination is made based on the gathered information as whether the user is permitted access to the requested content (Col. 57, lines 64-67 & Col. 58, lines 39-43), which meets the limitation of determining if the received information satisfies a condition by comparing the received information to at least one condition.

Referring to claims 7, 9, Underwood discloses that access rights are used to determine access (Col. 58, lines 39-43), which meets the limitation of making an access control decision by applying a policy to the condition, a rule permitting the client computer operated by the user to connect to the one or more application sessions.

Referring to claims 8, 35, 41, Underwood discloses that the clients can establish sessions with multiple web servers (Col. 1, lines 48-53), which meets the limitation of a first one of the application sessions is running on a first server and a second one of the application sessions is running on a second server, the policy engine further comprises stored data associated with one or more servers executing application sessions.

Referring to claims 10, 37, Underwood discloses that the session connection is made responsive to a user interface action (Col. 63, lines 26-59), which meets the limitation of the connection between the user and the one or more application sessions is triggered by the selection of a single user interface element.

Referring to claims 11, 38, 44, Underwood discloses that the user can abort the sessions (Col. 60, lines 26-29), which meets the limitation of a disconnect request to disconnect the first application session associated with the user and the second application session associated with the user, and disconnecting, by the session server, the first and second application sessions.

Referring to claims 12, 13, 20, 39, Underwood discloses that the AFSession component maintains whether or not the session was aborted (Col. 59, lines 52-62 & Col. 60, lines 26-29), which meets the limitation of at least one data record associated with the first and second application sessions to indicate that the first and second application sessions are disconnected, continuing, by the session server, execution of at least one of the disconnected application sessions.

Referring to claims 19, 25, 43, Underwood discloses that sessions can be associated with different users from the same role (Col. 44, lines 20-33), which meets the limitation of the one or more application sessions was associated with a first client computer prior to establishing the connection and, after establishing the connection, the one or more application sessions is connected to a second client computer.

Referring to claim 22, Underwood discloses that the session framework provides the means to provide session information (Col. 58, lines 29-43), which meets the limitation of the identifying one or more applications sessions is automatic upon receipt of authentication information.

Referring to claims 23, 24, Underwood discloses that a message is transmitted when a session is aborted (Col. 47, lines 23-26), which meets the limitation of providing for receiving application output from a one or more previously disconnected application sessions associated with the user in response to the transmitted information, disconnecting at least one active application session associated with the user in response to the received information.

Referring to claim 26, Underwood discloses that access rights are used to determine access (Col. 58, lines 39-43), which meets the limitation of the receipt of application output from

the one or more active application sessions is subject to a rule permitting the user to have a client computer operated by the user connect to the one or more active application sessions.

Referring to claim 27, Underwood discloses that the session connection is made responsive to a user interface action (Col. 63, lines 26-59), which meets the limitation of the receipt of application output from the one or more active application sessions and the receipt of application output from the one or more disconnected application sessions are triggered by the selection of a single use interface element.

Referring to claim 28, Underwood discloses that the information regarding the user and the session is gathered using various scripts (Col. 58, lines 11-25, 45-60 & Col. 59, lines 35-45 & Col. 60, lines 10-67). A determination is made based on the gathered information as whether the user is permitted access to the requested content (Col. 57, lines 64-67 & Col. 58, lines 39-43). The information gathered includes user and session information (Col. 58, lines 45-60). If permitted, the user is granted access to the requested resource (Col. 57, lines 62-64), which meets the limitation of the one or more disconnected application sessions was connected to a first client computer prior to disconnection and, at connection, the one or more disconnected application session is reconnected to the first client computer.

Referring to claim 29, Underwood discloses that sessions can be associated with different users from the same role (Col. 44, lines 20-33), which meets the limitation of the one or more disconnected application sessions was connected to a first client computer prior to disconnection and, at connection, the one or more disconnected application session is connected to a second client computer.

Referring to claims 31-33, Underwood discloses that information is gathered by remote monitoring agents (Col. 237, lines 19-23), which meets the limitation of the collection agent executes on the client node, the policy engine transmits the collection agent to the client node, the policy engine transmits instructions to the collection agent determining the type of information the collection agent gathers.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin E. Lanier whose telephone number is 571-272-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 6:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number:
10/711,731
Art Unit: 2132

Page 8

/Benjamin E Lanier/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2132